

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 14-17 and 19-24 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 17, 21 and 22 are amended. Claims 13 and 18 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the underlying subject matter. No new matter is introduced.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all outstanding grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

Applicants thank Examiner Kelvin Lin and SPE Andy Caldwell for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the personal interview (hereinafter, "Examiner interview") February 7, 2006. During the Examiner interview, Applicants' representative discussed proposed claim amendments for clarification and to overcome the pending rejections. The claims have been amended in accordance with discussions during the Examiner interview. As discussed, independent claims 1, 12 and 17 recite "allowing the consumer to resume executing the paused event so that execution of the paused event resumes prior to writing the log entry information to the log file." Accordingly, independent claim 21 recites "allowing the consumer to resume executing the paused event, prior to writing the log entry information to the log file." As discussed, the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Koseki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,732,124, thus the claims are patentable over the applied art.

The Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) claims 1-12, 14-17 and 19-24 as being anticipated by Koseki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,732,124 (hereinafter "*Koseki*"). Applicants traverse these rejections.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants submit that *Koseki* does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element of the claimed invention.

Koseki does not disclose or suggest, at least, "allowing the consumer to resume executing the paused event so that execution of the paused event resumes prior to writing the log entry information to the log file," as in claims 1, 12 and 17. In the section cited by the office action at page 4, paragraph 2(iv)(2), *Koseki* states that, in a synchronous request, the transaction has to wait for the log write daemon to completely write the log to the log volume, and, in a asynchronous request, the transaction can immediately proceed to the next

step. See column 39, lines 29 - 35. In contrast, the claims recite allowing the consumer to resume executing the paused event so that execution of the paused event resumes prior to writing the log entry information to the log file. Nowhere does *Koseki* disclose or suggest these features. Therefore, claims 1, 12 and 17 are patentable over *Koseki*, for at least these reasons.

Similarly, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest "allowing the consumer to resume executing the paused event, prior to writing the log entry information to the log file; and writing the log entry information to the log file using the log entry clone," as in independent claim 21. Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over *Koseki* for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-11 depend from independent claim 1, claims 14-16 depend from independent claim 12, claims 19-20 depend from independent claim 17, and claims 22-24 depend from independent claim 21. Therefore, claims 2-11, 14-16, 19-20 and 22-24 are patentable for the reasons stated above and for the additional features they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that all of the objections and rejections against this application have been fully addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections and a notice of allowance for the application are respectfully requested.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's deposit account no. 08-2025.

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephonic interview would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: May 8, 2006

Sean S. Wooden, Reg. No. 43,997

ANDREWS KURTH LLP

1350 I Street, NW

Suite 1100

Washington, D.C. 20005

Telephone: (202) 662-2700

Fax: (202) 662-2739